

13
13
14. (Once Amended) The method of claim 13 wherein the step of automatically identifying the visitor comprises:

comparing the user code with a plurality of stored codes; and

determining an identity of the visitor from at least one stored code of the plurality of stored codes that matches the user code.

14
16. (Once Amended) The method of claim 14 wherein the user interface is a microphone and the user code is a sound created by the visitor.

19. (Once Amended) The method of claim 18 wherein the audio signal is one of a plurality of alarm signals, wherein the alarm signal transmitted is dependent upon the number of times the user code is entered within a predetermined timeframe.

15
20. (Once Amended) The method of claim 14 wherein the signal transmitted in response to the user code is a radio frequency signal to be received by a communication device at a remote location through which a home dweller and the visitor are able to communicate.

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 5-9, 13, 14, 16, 19, and 20 were amended to clear up matters of form and to ensure proper antecedent throughout, thereby placing all of the claims remaining in the application in condition for allowance. Thus, claims 1-20 remain pending in the present application. Attached hereto is a marked up version of the changes made to the claims by the present amendment. The attached page is captioned "Version With Markings to Show

Changes Made.” No new matter was presented and such amendments are deemed unobjectionable. Entry thereof is respectfully requested. It is also respectfully requested that the Examiner reconsider the present application and claims as currently pending in view of the following remarks.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

In the Office Action, claims 1-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as allegedly being anticipated by Sheasley, U.S. Patent 5,877,683 (“Sheasley”). Applicant respectfully asserts that the claims are not anticipated by Sheasley and therefore traverses the rejection of claims 1-20 based on the accompanying argument.

The test for determining if a reference anticipates a claim, for purposes of a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102, is whether the reference discloses all the elements of the claimed combination, or the mechanical equivalents thereof functioning in substantially the same way to produce substantially the same results. As noted by the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit in *Lindemann Maschinenfabrick GmbH v. American Hoist and Derrick Co.*, 221 USPQ 481, 485 (Fed. Cir. 1984), in evaluating the sufficiency of an anticipation rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102, the Court stated:

Anticipation requires the presence in a single prior art reference disclosure of each and every element of the claimed invention, arranged as in the claim.

Therefore, if the cited reference does not disclose each and every element of the claimed invention, then the cited reference fails to anticipate the claimed invention and, thus, the claimed invention is distinguishable over the cited reference.

With respect to the rejection of independent claim 1, the Sheasley reference fails to disclose each and every element as arranged therein. Applicant's independent claim 1 recites

a doorbell arrangement including a user interface for entering a user code indicative of a specific visitor; a logic circuit for identifying the specific visitor based on the entered user code; and a signal transmitter for transmitting a particular response signal wherein the particular response signal is based on the identification of the specific visitor by the logic circuit. Applicant's independent claim 13 recites a method of identifying a visitor by using a doorbell arrangement having a user interface for entering a user code. The method includes the following steps: receiving the user code via the user interface wherein the user code is indicative of the visitor; automatically identifying the visitor from the user code; and transmitting a signal in response to the identification of the visitor, wherein the response signal is indicative of the visitor.

The Sheasley reference appears to disclose a home invasion alarm system in which one or more users are in residence within the home at the time of need. The alarm system includes an operation sequence in which, *inter alia*, a user identifies a visitor and then takes appropriate action by pressing a disarm key code, if the user decides that the visitor is welcome. If, however, the user determines that a visitor is unwelcome, then the user ignores a first warning signal and permits a second warning signal to activate audibly or visually.

In contrast to Sheasley, Applicant's invention -- not a user thereof -- identifies a visitor and takes further action accordingly. Therefore, independent claims 1 and 13 are distinguishable over the Sheasley reference.

Based upon the above argument, Applicant respectfully submits that the Sheasley reference does not disclose each and every element arranged as in claims 1 and 13 of Applicant's independent claims. Therefore, in applying the test for anticipation as set forth above in *Lindemann*, Sheasley does not anticipate independent claims 1 and 13. Further, under principles of claim dependency and for at least the reasons stated above, Sheasley does

PATENT

Docket 10017258-1

not anticipate any of the dependent claims either. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 is respectfully requested.

Conclusion


In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the pending independent and dependent claims are in proper form, define patentably over the cited references, and are all allowable. Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests that the Examiner's objections and rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102 be reconsidered and withdrawn and that a formal Notice of Allowance of the application be issued.

If the Examiner has any questions with respect to any matter now of record, the Applicant's agent may be reached at the telephone number below. Please grant any required extensions of time and charge any fees due in connection with this request to deposit account no. 08-2025.

Date: 11/20/03

Respectfully submitted,


WILMER, CUTLER & PICKERING



John W. Ryan
Reg. No. 33,771

Steven B. Walmsley
Reg. No. 48,021

Wilmer, Cutler & Pickering
2445 M Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20037-1420
(202) 663-6000
(202) 663-6363 (facsimile)

**Version With Markings to Show Changes Made**

Pursuant to 37 CFR § 1.121, the following is a copy of all amendments with deletions indicated by bracketing and additions indicated by underlining.

In the Claims

Claims 1, 2, 5-9, 13, 14, 16, 19, and 20 have been amended as follows:

1. (Once Amended) A doorbell arrangement comprising:
a user interface for entering a user code indicative of a [specific] visitor;
a logic circuit for identifying the [specific] visitor based on the [entered] user code; and
a signal transmitter for transmitting a [particular] response signal wherein the [particular] response signal is based on the identification of the visitor [user] by the logic circuit.
2. (Once Amended) The arrangement of claim 1 further comprising a memory for storing the response signal [signals] to the signal transmitter.
5. (Once Amended) The arrangement of claim 1 wherein the user interface is a microphone and user code is a sound created by the visitor [user].
6. (Once Amended) The arrangement of claim 2, wherein the signal transmitter is a speaker and the [particular] response signal is an audio signal.

7. (Once Amended) The arrangement of claim 1 further comprising a computer for providing the response signal [signals] to the signal transmitter.

8. (Once Amended) The arrangement of claim 7, wherein the signal transmitter is a speaker and the [particular] response signal is an audio signal.

9. (Once Amended) The arrangement of claim 8 wherein the signal generator is a first communication device and the [particular] response signal is a radio frequency signal.

13. (Once Amended) A method of identifying a visitor by using a doorbell arrangement having a user interface for entering a user code, the method comprising:
receiving the user code via the user interface wherein the user code is indicative of the visitor;
automatically identifying the visitor from the user code; and
transmitting a signal in response to the identification of the visitor, wherein the [response] signal is indicative of the visitor.

14. (Once Amended) The method of claim 13 wherein the step of automatically identifying the visitor comprises:
comparing the user code with a plurality of stored codes; and
determining [the] an identity of the visitor from at least one stored code of the plurality of stored codes [the stored code] that matches the user code.

16. (Once Amended) The method of claim 14 wherein the user interface is a microphone and the user code is a sound created by the visitor [a user].

19. (Once Amended) The method of claim 18 wherein the audio signal is one of a plurality of alarm signals, wherein the alarm signal transmitted is [dependant] dependent upon the number of times the user code is [user codes are] entered within a predetermined timeframe.

20. (Once Amended) The method of claim 14 wherein the signal transmitted in response to the user code is a radio frequency signal to be received by a communication device at a remote location through which a home dweller and the visitor are [is] able to communicate.